

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To the grade of captain:

MEDICAL CORPS

Armstrong, Theodore H.
Austin, Theodore R.
Bennett, Thomas W.
Blood, Russell H.
Brown, John J.
Callaway, Raymond R.
Carmody, Robert F.
Davis, George H.
Eberhart, John J.
Flannery, John L.
Hantover, Matthew J.
Hoxie, Derrick A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Boundy, Charles M.
Carlson, Arnold J.
DeWitt, John C.
Graves, Harry C.
Herlihy, Thomas C.
Keithley, Charles L.
Kinzie, Frederick A.
Kretz, Charles H., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Bates, Ralph
Broesamle, Kenneth M.
Brown, Stanley W.
Canon, Rush L.
Crowe, Walter W.
Daniel, Lewis H.
Dempsey, James J.
Denen, Harry E.
Faubion, Bernard H.
Flaherty, John J.
Fowler, William M.
Frechette, Arthur R.
Holubek, Edward J.
Jeffreys, Frank E.
Kasper, Stephen T.
Koepke, Reimers D.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bishop, Roy E.
Martin, Alvo O.

To the grade of commander:

MEDICAL CORPS

Balkus, Vincent A.
Connor, Joseph J.
Errion, Arthur R.
Florence, Quentin J.
McMahon, Francis J.
Rieder, John J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Aldrich, John K.
Algire, Kent D.
Ball, Stuart M.
Barnett, Austin H., Jr.
Batchelder, Joseph H.
Blackman, Harold H.
Bloxxom, Elliott
Brown, Richard G.
Cain, Thomas C., Jr.
Callison, Gordon M.
Clark, Robert L., Jr.
Coleman, Fred
Cone, Daniel G.
Conner, Perry C.
Covell, Leon C., Jr.
Cross, Sydney E.
Desrosier, Arthur E.
Disher, Robert C.
Dollard, John T.
Eicher, Ronald
Ellis, William D.
Fowler, Marion V.
Fraser, Oliver W., Jr.
Freeborn, Stanley B., Jr.
Granston, Robert W.
Gregory, Robert J.
Harris, Virgil J., Jr.
Hartzell, Ivan C.

McComish, Daniel R.
McCrone, Andrew M.
Nettles, Jack E.
Nielsen, William C.
North, William J.
O'Leary, John P.
Paist, John B., Jr.
Parker, James W.
Parker, Stanley D.
Pollich, Gardiner T.
Porter, Ross A.
Quinn, Charles M., Jr.
Rapp, William A., Jr.
Raymond, Carl A., Jr.
Rice, Earl G., Jr.
Rieseberg, Robert W.
Rieve, Roland
Rollings, Phillip A.
Ross, William H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barnett, Thomas E.
Cocke, Thomas P.
Cooke, Frederick A. F.
Forbess, Ordin E.
Herring, Ingram L.
McLellan, Waldron M.
Merdinger, Charles J.
Neumann, Arthur C.
Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Buckingham, Herbert Jones, Glyn W.
Hewitt, Fenelon D., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Bernard, Damon E.
Brandon, William C., Jr.
Carney, Bruce H.
Collins, Robert S.
Combs, Oscar A.
Couvillon, Wade E., Jr.
Crolius, William E., Jr.
Dobson, David P.
Felcyn, Walter V.
Gallagher, Walter N.
Gargiulo, Edward A. H.
Graves, Raymond J.
Grysbeck, Joseph R.
Gullett, William I.
Hill, David A.
Hodge, Ferris G.
Jakubs, Stanley

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Boles, Claude L.
Chambers, Francis W., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Bernatitus, Ann A.
Richards, Erma A.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To the grade of captain:

MEDICAL CORPS

Feldman, Samuel R.
Lentz, Edmund T.
Porterfield, Marvin H.

To the grade of commander:

MEDICAL CORPS

Clein, Norman W.
DeLaney, Allen Y.
Kinsey, Jack L.
Meadows, Henry H., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bacon, John F.
Betterton, Rexford L.
Bouque, Roy L.
Burrage, Leonard F. III
Curry, Frederick C.
Ellison, James F.
Fenske, Theodore H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Benson, James I.
Lawlor, Jerome N.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ehrlicher, Gordian V.
Faye, Edwin N., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Hughes, John J. K.
Turner, William E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Siegel, Jacob

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sidney H. Browne, of New Jersey, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God, our Father, we have entered upon a new day challenged by tasks which are far beyond our own wisdom and strength and far larger than all party differences. Give us now a clearer vision of high and helpful things that we may do together.

We pray that Thou wilt make us more radiantly sure of Thyself and may we not lose the sense of Thy presence as we face our duties and responsibilities.

Thou knowest how frequently our minds and hearts are assailed with moods of doubt and despair, of futility and frustration. May we never accept the verdict of these low moments or take counsel with our fears.

Help us to affirm more earnestly the great divine certainties. Show us how we may have our life oriented in Thee and find the secret of peace for ourselves and the whole world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 8, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be excused as conferee on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) entitled "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended"; and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] be appointed in his stead.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) entitled "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary

period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended."

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, the same to become effective immediately.

With good wishes, I am,
Respectfully,

F. ETEL CARLYLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 879) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That F. ETEL CARLYLE, of North Carolina, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspapers report retail food prices jumped 2 percent in the last 2 weeks of November.

These newspapers quote administration officials as saying they are powerless to do anything about rocketing retail food prices because of a provision in the Defense Production Act which says price ceilings on food must reflect parity prices to farmers.

What attempts have these Government officials made to determine whether prices paid by consumers should reflect parity prices to farmers; whether there is an unconscionable price spread between the farmer-producer and the consumer?

If, as stated, 14 major farm products still are selling below parity, then who is gouging who?

Let it be remembered that Alan Valentine, President Truman's Economic Stabilization Administrator, is also a director of the Freeport Sulphur Co. which recently boosted the price of that war essential commodity 22 percent.

It is about time Government officials quit flimflamming the public and display the courage and intelligence to deal with the facts of life or resign and get out.

DISMANTLING OF GERMAN STEEL PLANTS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before and I am going to continue to speak, I am afraid, on the question of the dismantling of the steel plants in Germany. I have here a report which has just been published in the New York Times, which can scarcely be accused of being in any way pro-German. They criticize very severely the dismantling of a plant at Salzgitter, where both aluminum and steel have been made for years. This plant produced over 400,000 tons of steel before the end of the war. It is now dismantled, and produces 19,000 tons. Unemployment is waxing heavier and heavier in this region. We, the American taxpayers, are having to feed these people and take care of these unemployed. They are now sending 3,000 of their children on what are known as free holidays into the Russian zone. These children are returning to their embittered parents fully indoctrinated with the Communist philosophy.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include the remarks I made last evening at a dinner given in honor of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of our distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. Murdock] whose beautiful book on Constantino Brumidi, artist of the Capitol, called the Michelangelo of the Capitol, goes into the book stores today; and I further ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last evening to attend a dinner at the National Democratic Women's Club honoring Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, the talented and very charming wife of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Murdock], whose beautiful book on Constantino Brumidi goes into the book stores today.

There were present many distinguished people, including, of course, Senator and Mrs. McFarland, of Arizona; Congressman and Mrs. Patten, and Mrs. Wiley, president of the Chevy Chase Penwomen's League of which Dr. Murdock is a member. The wife of the Italian Ambassador was present in his absence in Italy and spoke delightfully. The wife of the air attaché, Signora Cigerza accompanied Signora Tarchiani.

Fourteen years of consecrated research on Mrs. Murdock's part have resulted in a most beautiful book which preserves for our generation and for generations yet unborn a record of this man who came to this country in the middle of the last century a political refugee, and of his works.

It is to Dr. Murdock that we owe the discovery of the grave of the man whose artistic genius and passionate devotion to the land of his adoption filled our Capitol Building with beauty. You will

recall that we appropriated \$200 to mark this grave.

Mr. Speaker, there are to be found in this volume unbelievably beautiful reproductions of examples of Brumidi's work which should make us aware that we have taken all too much for granted the beauty on these walls put there by the man who is called the Michelangelo of the Capitol.

Under unanimous consent granted me by this body, I am placing in the Appendix of the Record the few words I was privileged to speak last evening.

COMMUNISM IN ILLINOIS

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, apparently communism is not dead in the great State of Illinois. I hold in my hand a piece of Communist propaganda, issued by the Communist Party of Illinois, at 208 North Wells Street, Chicago, advocating to our young men in the State of Illinois, especially those in our great universities, that they refuse to be drafted and refuse to fight in the present war. This piece of literature says, among other things: "Is it not obvious that American leaders are wasting American lives to support another Chiang Kai-shek?" This literature is being circulated by the Communist Party through the Communist Party at the University of Chicago, and is going to the University of Illinois, Bradley University, Northwestern, and also the Chicago University. In 1949 when the Republicans were in control of the senate in the State of Illinois, an antisubversive committee was set up to investigate communism in the University of Chicago, and other universities and colleges within the State. This committee was headed by Senator Paul W. Broyles. The appropriation allotted to the committee was meager, and while investigators for the Broyles committee had a great deal of previous experience in investigating communism, yet the pressure by the Communist Party and its supporters in the legislature against the investigation made it impossible for this committee to effectively perform its function. On top of that, young Communists from the University of Chicago came to Springfield and picketed the committee during its attempt to ferret out instructors and students who were subversive in our State schools. These pickets were able to obtain the sympathy of a large segment of the Illinois press and radio news commentators. As a result of the tremendous opposition to the investigation, it failed to accomplish its purpose. Upon the convening of the Eighty-second Congress, I shall ask the Un-American Activities Committee to make a complete investigation of communism in the State of Illinois.

Chicago, and its largest institution of higher learning, the University of Chicago, has been a hotbed of communism for many years. It is high time that an objective study and report should be

made of communism in the State of Illinois and the extent of its influence in Illinois, as well as throughout the Nation.

HOW TO STOP HIGHER TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress: A word to the wise is sufficient. If you want to stop taxing, remember "no giving, little lending, and less spending."

THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFTON ALEXANDER WOODRUM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1950, the Honorable Clifton Alexander Woodrum departed this life, and the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation lost one of its most distinguished public servants. The passing of Clifton Alexander Woodrum brought deep sorrow to his many friends. His readiness at all times to listen to the problems of others and give freely of kindly advice and assistance have endeared him to a host of friends who mourn his loss.

Born in Roanoke, Va., on April 27, 1887, he was the son of Robert H. and Anna T. Woodrum. He was educated in the public schools of Roanoke, studied law at Washington and Lee University, and was licensed to practice in Roanoke on June 19, 1908. In 1917 he was elected Commonwealth's attorney for the city of Roanoke, and served in that capacity until August 1919, when he was unanimously chosen judge of the Hustings court for the city of Roanoke. He resigned from the bench on April 10, 1922, to become a candidate for Congress for the Sixth District of Virginia. He was successful in his candidacy and held his seat in this body until he resigned on September 1, 1945, to become the president of the American Plant Food Council, which position he occupied at the time of his death.

As a capable and illustrious legislator he was a vital force in shaping the trend of legislation in our country, and throughout his long term of service held high place in the respect and admiration of his colleagues. His interest and careful attention to the needs of his people have left an indelible impression on our area of Virginia such as made by few men. His sterling character and pleasing personality attracted to him a host of friends in Washington as well as throughout the State of Virginia.

I have been greatly impressed by the esteem and affection in which he is held in every hamlet of our district.

It is a great privilege and honor to have known Clifton Alexander Woodrum, and to have been one of his many friends. I feel a sincere sense of indebtedness to him for his kindness and assistance to me upon taking the seat in this body for the Sixth District of Virginia which he filled with great distinction for over 22 years.

It is with deep sorrow and a feeling of keen personal loss that I make this tribute to the memory of our distinguished friend, and offer sincere sympathy to his gracious and devoted wife, to his son, Clifton Alexander Woodrum, Jr., and to his daughter, Martha Anne Woodrum.

Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1950, the board of directors of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., adopted the following in memoriam resolution in honor of the late Clifton A. Woodrum:

Whereas the Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum served with distinction and honor as the first president of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., until his death October 6, 1950; and

Whereas he established himself in the respect and affection of his State and Nation for his courageous and effective championship of the principles upon which our private enterprise system is founded; and

Whereas he rendered notable and effective service in creating a better understanding of the fertilizer industry, its contribution to agriculture and its relation to the national economy as a whole; and

Whereas as an acknowledged leader in Congress for 23 years he was constructive, practical, and farsighted in his approach to national affairs, always consistent with common sense in encouraging private initiative and discouraging regimentation; and

Whereas by his character and devotion to duty, his courage of conviction, his integrity of purpose and his love of mankind, he established himself in the esteem of all who knew him and was singularly effective as a spokesman for business without being unmindful of the well-being of his fellow citizens; and

Whereas his untimely death removes from government and business a leader of influence for a better, stronger Nation, a friend with practical understanding of human weaknesses and appreciation for human fortitude: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors, in session this 6th day of December 1950, unanimously record their respect, appreciation, and admiration for the late Clifton A. Woodrum, and recognize his effective leadership in the affairs of state and in the field of industry and particularly his manifold contributions in strengthening American business as the best safeguard of American democratic institutions, American initiative, and American strength; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the family of the deceased; that a copy be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting; that a copy be incorporated in the 1951 Journal of Proceedings of the American Plant Food Council; and that a copy be sent to each of the fertilizer trade magazines.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the mere mention of the name "Cliff Woodrum" brings to us who knew him memories of a sweet character, a noble-minded gentleman, a great legislator, and a great American.

As I am speaking now I can see him during the years we served together in the House of Representatives, in conversation with him, on the floor of the House, and particularly the able and brilliant manner in which he handled legislation entrusted to his care. I can see him during the dark days preceding World War II, fighting in committees and in the well of the House, for the passage of legislation of vital importance to the preservation of our country. I can

see that gray hair of his, that fine noble countenance. It seems he is with us today.

He voluntarily retired from the National House of Representatives, and the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON], who has announced his death, succeeded him.

On one occasion I went into his district to speak for him. Mrs. McCormack and I shall never forget the hospitality we received from him and the good people of his district on that occasion.

It is difficult to express in words the thoughts that I have in relation to Cliff Woodrum. In his passing Virginia has lost one of its outstanding sons and the Nation one of its outstanding citizens. I join with my colleagues in expressing to the Virginia delegation our keen regret as well as our sympathy in the passing of our distinguished late friend and colleague, and in particular to Mrs. Woodrum and her daughter and son I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we all heard with a deep sense of loss and regret of the death of our former colleague, Cliff Woodrum, of Roanoke, Va.

I had the honor to serve with Cliff Woodrum in this House for many years. Had he died 10 years ago it would have been a day of solemn mourning for this House and for the Nation. He occupied a most important position when he was a Member of the House. His record is written in numerous debates on vital matters that occurred during his time of service. For a long period he was chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Committee.

In any important matters which came up in the House during those years Cliff Woodrum was foremost in their consideration. He has written a fine record here in this House and in the country at large. I am sure we all feel a deep sense of loss and a deep sense of sympathy for his splendid family in the death of this man in the prime of life.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sense of sympathy in the loss of one of the finest legislators with whom I have associated since I have been in Congress. Cliff Woodrum to me was the ideal Member of the House of Representatives; he was honorable, capable, and most sincere in everything that he did. Could I emulate and follow the example of but one legislator with whom I have ever served, that Member I have said many times, would be Cliff Woodrum. He was my ideal Member of Congress. I feel that we lost a great friend, and the country a great man when Cliff Woodrum was carried to the Great Beyond.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia has well spoken of the great willingness of Cliff Woodrum to lend assistance and support

to those whom he might be able to help. Of that I can bear witness out of personal experience. Back in 1935 when I first came to the House, it fell to my lot to present a matter on the floor of the House that involved tremendous personal interest to certain people in my district. At the conclusion of my remarks a gentleman whom I did not know—I had not been here long enough to know anyone—made a splendid argument in support of the position I had taken, and that position prevailed. Subsequently I learned that the gentleman who had come to my assistance—one of the newest, youngest Members of the House—was Cliff Woodrum, one of the great, outstanding Members of the House. He did not know me, but took it upon himself, out of the greatness of his heart, to help me in what for me, as a complete beginner here, was a rather trying and difficult situation. Subsequent to that time I came to know Cliff Woodrum very, very well.

I think if any one thing could be said of him and stressed more than others it was that while he was great enough and able enough to deal with the tremendous responsibilities that came to him as one of the outstanding men of responsibility in the House, he never lost the common touch; he never lost that great solicitude for the minor things with which he might be able to help. That, I say, was a great tribute.

Cliff Woodrum was one of the most able debaters to whom I have ever listened. While he was strong, with it all he was gentle. I never knew him to take an undue or an unfair advantage of anyone, either because he might have been better informed on the matter before the House or because he might have had a little greater capacity or ability in presentation. That also was a great attribute.

I could say many other things, Mr. Speaker, but I have said only these few things to add my word of sympathy to his family and to wish for them the comfort that may be theirs in the sure knowledge that those of us here who knew Cliff Woodrum join with them in their great sorrow.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to serve in the House with our distinguished former colleague, Cliff Woodrum. However, I did have the pleasure of seeing him and being associated with him occasionally during the past several years. I learned to respect him and to understand the high esteem and the admiration in which he was held by those who knew him intimately.

I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of Cliff Woodrum and desire to express my sympathy to his family.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, our late former colleague, my friend, Cliff Woodrum, has passed away, but he left to us all a record of achievement seldom equaled by men who have chosen the tedious, uncertain, and quite frequently thankless job of public service. Those

who had the honor of serving with him in the world's greatest deliberative body, the United States House of Representatives, will never forget this great Virginian.

But for the accident of a name, Cliff Woodrum would have been, when he decided to retire from politics, the chairman of the powerful Committee on Appropriations; I am informed that he and the now distinguished chairman, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, came to Congress at the same time and that Mr. CANNON was elected chairman because his name came first on the alphabet of the members, thereby giving him the seniority by which all chairmen are chosen.

Mr. Woodrum never failed to work in the closest harmony and cooperation with his chairman. In the darkest days of World War II I can see Cliff Woodrum now carrying the banner of his committee against uncertain and frequent odds on the floor of the House. Cliff Woodrum's life was replete with acts of helping his fellows. He was always part and parcel of the struggle for his brother's cause. He never stopped long enough to reflect that the uncertain hand would some day beckon him home. He did not take time to rest from the trials of his arduous undertakings. He died with his boots on. He died in the midst of his labor to bring greater blessings to the man who tills the soil. Mr. Speaker, the workman lost one of his greatest benefactors when Cliff Woodrum "turned again home."

Cliff Woodrum was too busy to realize that—

Such a tide as moving seems asleep,

Too full for sound and foam,

When that which came from out the boundless deep

Turns again home.

Mr. Speaker, truly Cliff Woodrum has embarked on that bourn from which no traveler returns, but his legacy to Americans yet unborn, as well as those now living, will never be tarnished by the troth or everlasting moments of time. Though he has gone down the way of permanent sleep the Nation will be a greater Nation, the world will be a greater world, because he lived and worked for his fellow man.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and especially the members from Virginia in expressing my feeling of personal loss upon the passing of Cliff Woodrum. When I first came to this body a number of years ago, Cliff Woodrum was one of the first men I met and learned to love and admire. Whenever he took the floor of the House, Members on both sides of the aisle listened in rapt attention to what he had to say. He was one of the most distinguished Members of this body, he was one of the most convincing debaters who ever took the floor of the House of Representatives, he was a capable legislator and a very distinguished man. He was greatly admired and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. A few years ago I was privileged

to deliver an address in his home city of Roanoke, Va. From the people who knew him best and whom he served so ably in this body, one learned the deep faith, confidence, and affection in which he was held by them. Virginia has lost one of her great sons and the Nation one of its illustrious statesmen. I join the delegation from Virginia and the Members of this House in expressing my sense of personal loss and my sympathy to his widow and to his family.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I shall always count it as one of my great privileges that, when I was assigned to the Appropriations Committee, my first subcommittee was the Committee on Independent Offices, then headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Cliff Woodrum. I sat at his feet for several years. Everyone who has ever served on that committee will agree with me, I know, when I say it was not only a privilege, it was a great training to be there.

This man was one of the great men of the country in our time. I have always thought it was one of the unfortunate quirks of history not merely that Cliff Woodrum did not have an opportunity to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but also that he did not have the opportunity to become President of the United States. He had the capacity for being a great President.

A few years ago, and some time after he had left the House of Representatives, Mr. Woodrum responded to an invitation to make the annual memorial address for the Elks Lodge in Rapid City, S. Dak., in my district. Accepting that invitation—I never knew quite why—he spent 2 days with us and made a great many friends in my part of the country. They were impressed by his spirit, his personality, and his great capacity. We shall always hold him in reverence. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously shocked by Cliff Woodrum's death. I am glad to have this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to his memory.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, in describing Cliff Woodrum, I said he was a man that had the stature, the mentality, the personality of a great statesman, and that he was of the stature and timber that really belonged in the White House and would grace the White House. I firmly believed that at that time and I still believe it. In Cliff Woodrum's death the Nation has lost one of the greatest of the great.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Cliff Woodrum during his entire public career. When he was Commonwealth's attorney in the city of Roanoke, I was counsel for the State tax commission, and as such collaborated with him in the trial of tax cases which arose in his city. When he was elevated to the bench, I tried several important cases before him. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the House and suc-

ceeded him as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Cliff Woodrum devoted the best years of his life to the service of his State and Nation. His conspicuous ability, untiring energy, striking appearance, pleasing personality, and intense patriotism made him one of the outstanding leaders of this body. When he spoke on the floor of the House, he commanded attention and his remarks always carried conviction.

The Commonwealth of Virginia is proud of his record and mourns his untimely death. Today we join with his former colleagues in paying tribute to this truly great Virginia gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentlemen who have just spoken in everything they have said about my friend, Cliff Woodrum.

I met him the first day he came to Congress, and was intimately associated with him during all the years that he was a Member of this House. I do not hesitate to say that Virginia never sent a worthier son to the Congress of the United States than Cliff Woodrum.

We had a clash at one time on the floor of this House, the result of which has always stuck in my mind as a manifestation of that character that distinguished him as one of the outstanding Members of the Congress. In 1938 he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. We had up one of those large spending bills. Everyone knew of my intense interest in rural electrification. I offered an amendment for the first \$100,000,000 for that purpose. It rather took Mr. Woodrum by surprise, and he opposed it. We finally adopted the amendment by seven votes in the Committee of the Whole, and then adopted it on the floor of the House over his protest.

That fall, after he had gone home, traveled over his district, he came back, and in his attitude manifested that high degree of magnanimity that characterized his entire career. He came to me and said, "John, I want to apologize to you. I was wrong in opposing your rural electrification amendment. Nothing else that has ever been done has inspired so much hope and enthusiasm among the farmers of Virginia as your amendment providing those funds for rural electrification."

I bring this incident to your attention to show you the magnanimity of this magnificent servant, this great man, this great American whose passing we all mourn today.

God grant that he may greet the coming of another age of youth and usefulness in another radiant Easter beyond the gates of night.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The curtain of death has been drawn on a noble and illustrious life and the work and career of a great man ends. It was my pleasure to know Mr. Woodrum only a short while but I formed of him an opinion that

placed him among the great men of this Nation.

I will remember that, when Mr. Woodrum gave notice that he was going to retire from the legislative halls, our Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, gave one of the finest tributes to Mr. Woodrum I ever heard. He placed him then along with Jefferson, Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and other illustrious statesmen.

The last time I saw Mr. Woodrum he appeared on the stage with me in my district to dedicate the Pompano Air Field. With him was his daughter, who is an aviatrix and piloted him to this airfield.

At that time he made a wonderful speech emphasizing the importance aviation played in World War II and how much more important it would be in any future conflict.

He was held in the highest esteem and admiration by his fellow citizens in Roanoke, as well as the entire State, and this high regard for him found expression in naming the airport at Roanoke after him and in his honor. This airport is now known as the Woodrum Air Field.

He was a grand and renowned American and rendered invaluable services both in private and public life.

In the nobility and immensity of his works, Cliff Woodrum lives on—and truly it can be said of him:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Cliff Woodrum was a real Virginian, and better than that could be said of no man.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, for I feel irresistibly impelled to say that I join fervently in every tribute that has been paid to Cliff Woodrum.

The great State of Virginia has always been distinguished for the character and devotion of the men who have been sent by her to the Congress. Never has Virginia, or any other State sent as a Member of either House a more able, honorable, diligent, or effective servant than Cliff Woodrum. He not only was the Representative of his district, but also of State and Nation. We are grateful for the proud record the "Mother of Presidents" has made in the sons and daughters she has bred and shared their fruitful public services with the National Government. There never has been a man more worthy of the highest honor than our friend whom we "have loved long since and lost awhile."

Every heart who knew him is bowed in grief and sympathy with the bereaved family.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The late Clifton Alexander Woodrum was elected a Member of the House of Representatives for 12 consecutive terms and served with signed ability from March 4, 1923, until his resignation on December 31, 1945, to become president of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., in which capacity he was serving at the time of his death some days ago.

Cliff Woodrum, shortly after he came to the House, became a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He was unusually well informed as to the fiscal affairs of the Government. He was painstaking and thorough in preparing and presenting appropriation bill to the House.

Cliff Woodrum had a good personality. He possessed an especially attractive voice. He was not only an able legislator but he was possessed of unusual executive ability. He presided well and most satisfactorily when called to the chair to preside in the Committee of the Whole, as was often the case. He was one of the most accomplished presiding officers within my recollection.

Cliff Woodrum was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He had a most successful career. There was genuine regret in the House when he resigned. I gladly join in tribute to his services as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the expressions so sincerely stated this morning indicate the high esteem and affection in which our former Member, Clifton Woodrum, was held by this body. We of Virginia feel highly honored to have been represented by a man of such high character and a man of his ability.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point on the life and services of the late Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, Clifton A. Woodrum was a native Virginian. He was born in Roanoke, Roanoke County. There he maintained his residence for all of the 63 years he lived. He attended the public schools of Roanoke. He received a degree from the Medical College of Virginia in pharmacy. He graduated from Washington and Lee University in law. He practiced law in Roanoke. He served as Commonwealth Attorney and judge of the Hustings court of Roanoke. He was elected to Congress in 1922. He served 11 consecutive terms, resigning in 1945 to become president of the American Plant Food Council.

While my association with Judge Woodrum was limited, I held him in high esteem. He was able, honest, and courageous. He was a man of sterling character. He possessed a magnetic personality. He had, in a marked degree, the characteristics of a great leader. While charitable with his enemies, he never compromised with wrong.

As a servant of his people and an exponent of progressive democracy, he was

an influential Member of the Congress. He served as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Coming to Congress the same year that Chairman CLARENCE CANNON came, he was the ranking member when Mr. CANNON became chairman. His work on the committee was outstanding. His services during the war years were indispensable to the prosecution of the war.

Judge Woodrum was a fluent and convincing speaker. Because of his talents in debate, he wielded great influence. Constituents of mine still talk of great orations he delivered on many occasions in my district. They were masterpieces in rhetoric and logic.

He was a man among men, not a dreamer in the shadows. He was always out in front leading the parade for a better America. Virginia, America, and the world are richer and better for his having lived. His life was a blessing to mankind.

To his family I say, you should be happy, not at his passing, but for the rich heritage that he bequeathed. He was deeply devoted to you.

"THEY BROUGHT THEIR WOUNDED WITH THEM"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Sunday morning I heard a part of one of the most thrilling newscasts I have heard in my whole life. It was the news that the marines and the Third Division rescue column had joined up and had made the 30 miles into Hungnam. The short sentences ran something like this:

The marines came out proud. They were tired and hollow-eyed from 12 days of fighting but they brought their dead and wounded with them. They left behind no equipment that would be of benefit to the enemy. They carried with them what they would need for future fighting.

Mr. Speaker, those beleaguered men had made one of the great stands of all time. They had fought in the most severe weather ever encountered by United States troops in combat. They had been outnumbered seven to one. They were surrounded on all sides. They had to replace a bridge under fire. They had to fight their way down a winding, icy road in a narrow canyon with the enemy firing from protected heights and bunkers. They had to knock out road blocks and go through superior numbers. But they came through.

Mr. Speaker, there are many famous words in the history of American valor. I shall not attempt to recount them in this limited time. Many words, some complimentary, a few uncomplimentary, have been spoken and written about the United States Marine Corps—but while there remains such a thing as honor among men, and as long as hearts respond to the dignity of man and value

the life of one human soul, let these words be remembered:

The marines came out proud—they brought their wounded with them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a personal letter from Mr. Clayton. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Clayton has given me permission to put the letter in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two speeches on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the Jewish Community in Charleston, S. C., and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the one by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Tobias, come first, and that of Admiral Lewis L. Strauss come second.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Courier-Journal.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. Gross) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each a letter from a constituent.

Mr. NELSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a soldier constituent.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include some articles.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter which was sent to all Members of the House regarding the so-called 21-day rule.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in

two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from editorials.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a portion of a letter.

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT, 1947

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3182)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'December 31, 1950' in each place it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1951.'"

"SEC. 2. Section 204 (j) (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That as used in this Act the term "resolution" shall not be construed to be limited to ordinances or other legislative acts, and any resolution heretofore adopted by any local governing body is here-

by declared to be effective for the purpose of this section 204 (j) (3) or section 204 (f) (1), whether or not such resolution was legislative in character; and no suit or action shall be brought under section 205 of this Act, or any other provision of law, on the basis of any administrative decision or the decision of any court that the resolution described in this Act must be a legislative act."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

B. R. MAYBANK,
GLEN TAYLOR,
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
JOHN W. BRICKER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution provided for a 2 months' extension in the automatic decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The House amendment provided for a 3 months' extension of this provision. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment on this point.

The Senate joint resolution also contained a provision clarifying the provisions of the existing law with respect to the action of local governing bodies in removing and continuing rent control. A recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit interpreted the provisions relating to decontrol by local bodies to mean that where under local law a different procedure is prescribed for legislative action by the local governing body than that prescribed for other action, a decontrol resolution must be adopted in accordance with the procedure prescribed for legislative action. The amendment is designed to make it clear that, for the purpose of removing rent controls or continuing them, resolutions heretofore or hereafter adopted which comply in all other respects with applicable local law are valid even though the procedure prescribed for legislative action was not followed. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the Senate joint resolution on this point.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the act extending rent control. It is a unanimous report of the conferees.

The amendment of the Senate provided that the act of the governing body of the municipality or local subdivision was not limited to ordinances or other

legislative acts, and any resolution heretofore adopted by any local governing body is declared to be effective. This applied not only from the effective date of the act but was retroactive and makes action decontrolling the cities valid if done in conformity with the provisions of this act. The House concurred in this amendment.

The Senate bill provided that the Rent Control Act shall be effective until February 28, 1951; the House bill provided an extension of 90 days, or 3 months, to March 31 of next year. The Senate receded and concurred in the House amendment. So, under the act rent control is extended until March 31 of next year. The House conferees felt that it was essential that the act be extended for 90 days in order that it might be sufficiently considered by the House. We all know that a new Congress takes a long time to organize; there will be vacancies to be filled on the Ways and Means Committee, and, after those vacancies are filled, the Ways and Means Committee will proceed to fill vacancies on various committees. Those committees cannot function until they have been reported to the House and the action of the Ways and Means Committee has been confirmed by this body. We felt therefore that it was absolutely essential that the extension should continue for 3 months in order that proper consideration might be given to this question of the continuation of rent control.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The same thing, of course, applies to our Republican friends' action on the part of the Republican committee on committees in relation to their members.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman is correct.

It was absolutely essential, and we felt that we made a very good agreement in this respect. We accepted the Senate amendment. The conferees on the part of the Senate in turn accepted the House amendment. We think this is substantially the bill as passed by the House, notwithstanding the agreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will also give an opportunity to about 40 legislatures in this country to consider rent-control legislation, and the States will also be given additional time, and the communities likewise, who want to comply or act under the law.

Mr. SPENCE. That is true, and the act as extended continues every right to municipalities to extend the act until June 30, 1951, if they desire to do so, or to discontinue rent control by a resolution of the governing body. Some cities have taken action that probably this might affect. The city of Los Angeles, which may be decontrolled by the passage of this amendment, can repeal the ordinances it has passed which have not yet become effective by reason of court

action, and has it within its power to continue rent control in that city if it so desires. We have left it up to the cities; we have placed it back with local self-government, just where it should be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the conferees have done the best job they could and that they brought in a report which represents their best thinking on the subject. I wish, however, to direct the attention of the membership to what we do if we adopt this conference report. We override a decision of the court of appeals so that the people in the far West, particularly the people in the city of Los Angeles, will be deprived by their right to review anything that their local governing body has done or may do. In other words, as you probably know, if the local governing body of most localities throughout the West adopt a resolution of a legislative character or setting up policy, as these rent laws do, the people have a right within 30 days to demand a referendum and then determine for themselves whether that should be the law or not.

Under the provision which is written into the bill at this time you deprive those people of that right. You will now permit any local council to deprive the people in the community of the right to a referendum and to review what their city council or local governing body may do. If we agree to this conference report we are going to validate the decontrol action of the City Council of Los Angeles, and possibly of other places, contrary to the will of their people who seek to pass upon it by referendum.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman oppose this conference report?

Mr. MULTER. I am constrained to oppose the conference report because of that provision which was defeated on the floor of the House last week. We had this identical provision submitted to us by way of amendment last week and the House rejected it. It is now put into the bill by the conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Does the gentleman think it is desirable that we get the additional 30 days for consideration by the House?

Mr. MULTER. I am quite in agreement it is important that we have 90 days rather than 60 days.

Mr. SPENCE. Does not the gentleman think that was very important?

Mr. MULTER. I heartily agree it is of the utmost importance.

Mr. SPENCE. The only way we could get it was to do a little trading with the Senate.

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate that. I know the chairman of the Committee on

Banking and Currency and the other conferees did the very best they could. I still feel, however, that we have a very, very bad provision in this bill. The least we should do is alert the people of those communities so that they can get busy at once and, if necessary, recall their council members or the members of their local boards or otherwise try to do their will and get the control they need. When this bill is signed by the President, those places will be decontrolled and will not again be controlled unless we change existing law next year.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman's position is he is opposed to the extension of rent control because of the particular amendment that was added by the Senate which does not provide for the 30 days for any referendum covering a city council's legislative act?

Mr. MULTER. I am in favor of extending rent control until we can bring in here a bill which will extend rent control where it is needed, if it is needed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But the gentleman opposes this conference report?

Mr. MULTER. I am opposed to this provision.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then the gentleman is opposing extension of rent control?

Mr. MULTER. I am not opposing extension of rent control. I am directing your attention to the fact that by this provision you are depriving your constituents of the right to a referendum on a question of the utmost importance to them.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I was very much opposed to this bill. I may have a peculiar idea of the duties of conferees; however, I signed the conference report under the belief that I was representing the House of Representatives and was morally bound to see that the position of the House was presented to the conference and that everything was done to protect the House provisions of the bill, although I am still opposed personally to the 90-day extension. That matter has now been adjudicated so that it becomes simply a question, on the one hand, whether the automatic decontrols should be continued for 60 or 90 days after December 31, 1950. The Senate had a provision for 60 days and we had a provision for 90 days. But, on the other hand, I thought that the controlling thing which bothered us more than anything else was the provision of law which authorized a municipality to decontrol by resolution. It was very clearly the intent of the Congress when it wrote the 1950 Rent Control Act that a governing body of a municipality might decontrol or continue control by passing a simple resolution. We provided in that act that they might decontrol by passing a resolution or by a referendum. Now the governing body chose the method of decontrol. It could either pass a resolution or it could provide for a referendum as to whether there would be decontrol. In some eight-hundred-odd cases the governing body adopted a resolution

which was honored by the Expediter and action was taken to decontrol those areas in which a resolution was adopted.

The matter went to the circuit court of appeals here in the District of Columbia and the circuit court of appeals picked out of clear air this issue as to whether we did not mean "ordinance" when we said "resolution." The matter had not been presented in any of the briefs submitted by either side of the controversy in the case. As I understand, the court on its own initiative framed the issue on whether we did not mean that a resolution included an ordinance. In other words, we had provided, and it was to be the intention to provide for administrative action only by the passage of a simple resolution, but the circuit court of appeals said that we intended that the resolution should be a legislative act which would have the full force and effect of an ordinance. So the Senate clarified that language by the provisions which are contained in the report.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In order to remove any doubts in the matter I would like to ask the gentleman this question, whether the amendment added in the Senate will validate the resolutions that have been passed by some twelve hundred cities and counties in the United States, and especially in the one passed in the city of Los Angeles, and remove the necessity of the Supreme Court acting further on the question that was presented to them on an appeal from the Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would assume that because of the action now being taken by the Congress in this respect that the matter now before the Supreme Court in the case of the City of Los Angeles against Tighe Woods, and others, has been completely settled and that there is nothing before the Supreme Court for adjudication in that case. But, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court in that case, the language that we have written into the law in the so-called Cain amendment provides that the term "resolution" as used in the act shall not be construed to be limited to ordinances or other legislative acts. It means, therefore, that the resolution referred to in the act is something different than an ordinance or other legislative acts. Then the language goes on to say: "Whether or not such resolution was legislative in character" and, further, that "no suit or action shall be brought under section 205 of the act or any other provision of law on the basis of any administrative decision or the decision of any court that the resolution described in this act must be a legislative act." So, notwithstanding any decision of the Supreme Court or the circuit court of appeals, that stands.

We have provided that the term "resolution" does not mean a legislative act. In direct answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that under the terms of this amendment it is our intention to

validate, and the language actually does validate, every resolution which has been passed by any governing body decontrolling or which might be passed by any Government body continuing controls, including the Los Angeles case.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is it the gentleman's opinion that by the adoption of this conference report it is mandatory for Mr. Tighe Woods to sign the resolution adopted by the City Council of Los Angeles?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Absolutely. That was our intention to begin with. We seek to clarify his position in this matter. Hereafter, as on all of these occasions in the past, this will be considered a mandate to Mr. Woods that he must issue an order upon the passage of a resolution by the governing body of the city, notwithstanding any position which he might take to the contrary in respect to the merits or equities or facts in the case.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY FROM AIR-MAIL PAY

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9184) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9184, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'Hara].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota: On page 3, strike out subparagraph (2), lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH to the text sought to be stricken by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'Hara]: On page 3, line 5, strike out beginning with the word "shall" down through the period in line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall in no event exceed the reasonable and necessary cost to the air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient management, of the mail transportation services rendered or to be rendered, including a fair return."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought before the House last Wednesday this legislation, all of us in the beginning stated the legislation was controversial, that there was disagreement with reference to its

various provisions. We worked rather diligently, some of you are aware, Wednesday here in the Committee, and the Committee rose late in the day. After that occurred it became the objective of those who are interested in finding a common meeting ground in regard to the provisions of this bill to hold additional meetings to see what we could work out which might be more acceptable to more of the Members who wanted to see something done. Accordingly we met from about 9:30 last Thursday morning until about 6 o'clock. Incidentally, we had with us representatives of the CAB, of the Post Office Department, and one member of the Hoover Commission when the Commission was in being, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

I can sincerely say to the members of the committee here assembled that a great effort was made to narrow the area of disagreement in regard to this important piece of legislation.

We agreed on some seven amendments. The question came up as to whether or not any Member is bound by the amendments. Of course, it has always been my contention that you do not bind Members of Congress very successfully. In the main each Member is a free agent and says what he wants to say and takes the action which he desires to take at any given moment. But I can say that as of the time we left that meeting Thursday, about 6 o'clock, there was no apparent overt disagreement on the part of any person. In my opinion we came near to getting together with reference to the seven amendments which will be offered here today to the Heselton bill. This, of course, does not mean each individual fully agrees with all which was done. The amendment I have just offered, which is one of the seven amendments, retains the cost standard which several of us said the other day was important to retain. It is a good anchor. It is the beginning, you might say, of the fundamental problem of doing this job of work well. May I say that almost to a word it is the language which the Civil Aeronautics Board wanted from the beginning. Although the language is not quite so specific as was the language we originally had in the Heselton bill, it definitely is the opinion of the authorities of the CAB that it constitutes a strong retention of the cost standard, a standard which the authorities of the CAB contended from the beginning is necessary to have in the legislation if the job is to be done well and efficiently.

As I said a moment ago it is hoped by each of us, and incidentally there were several members of the transportation subcommittee who attended the meeting all day long, and several others at least, two, who are not members of the transportation subcommittee; as I say it is hoped that we can work out this bill in such a way as to get a bill this session; yes, today. It is believed that the seven amendments to which I have referred do the job best as of this time.

It is my sincere hope that the Members of the Committee will go along with

us in our effort to bring about the adoption of these seven amendments, including the one I have just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the interested Members here on the floor, last Wednesday, when this matter was brought before the committee, met with the members of the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the period referred to, and resolved these differences to the point that it was believed that a bill we would pass today should be passed with these amendments adopted, agreed to, virtually, by the Members who participated in this conference, and we are bringing it to the House membership now with the explanation that this does what most of us want it to do, to bring about a compromise of the issues that were involved in the debate last week.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is true. The bill is not exactly what each person who was there would like to see if he were writing his own bill, but it is about the best we can get in an effort to see that a bill is written, and at the same time undertake to get substantially that which each interested Member wanted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] who has just spoken, has given you something of the picture of our attempt to work out the differences and difficulties which exist in this bill.

This amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Texas as a perfecting amendment to my amendment to strike out this language, as he has stated, and it is agreed to by those of us who sat in on the conference on these differences. While it is not completely satisfactory to me, I am supporting the amendment, and suggest that it be adopted in lieu of my amendment to strike out the language of the bill. That is in accordance with the labor and the effort put forth and the understanding had.

Permit me to say that in my minority report, which was filed in opposition to this bill, this is one of the things which caused me great concern. I am assuming that those who were in on the conference will also support the other six amendments which the gentleman has indicated would be offered.

Let me say to you frankly, I feel that the transportation of mail should be governed by the same rates and the same language, across the board, not only for air but for rail and for vessels that are carrying mail in sea commerce. My theory on that is that it is a fair principle to have the cost element the same in all of those. We are now setting up new language and a new measuring stick which will apply only to air. How it will work out and whether it will work out fairly to the taxpayers, whether it will work out fairly to the carriers, I do not know and I do not think anyone could say. However, it illustrates the difficulty of the problem that is involved in this legislation and in matters pertaining to interstate and foreign commerce in the carriage of mail, and should have future study and consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has partly answered the question I was going to ask, which was that if all of the seven amendments are adopted, then the bill would be less objectionable to him?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is correct. It is improved some, but I wish it might be further improved.

Let me say primarily from the viewpoint of the taxpayer and the Post Office Department, the ones who pay the bill, that I think in dealing with this subject we must approach it fairly, not only to the taxpayers in what we pay out for the carrying of the mail, the payment of subsidies as well, but also that it should be fair to the various transportation systems. But I do want to repeat that the manner in which we have worked out these differences is a compromise, and I think not only should this amendment be adopted but that the other amendments as they are offered should be adopted and made a part of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows, for many years I was a member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. And a very able member.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been my observation through my years of service on that committee that it has always been the aim and purpose of the committee to bring legislation to the floor on which the committee was in substantial agreement as far as anyone could work it out, recognizing the necessities of compromise to make it fair and equitable. I want to commend the gentleman and the members on both sides of the committee who worked along in his group for the effort they have made to compromise and work out this legislation.

The bill as originally introduced provided that there should be a definite separation of subsidy from the regular mail-carrying charge. While I felt there were some serious defects in the legislation as originally reported and while I think the compromise now reached may

not perhaps be perfect, yet I think it is a fair compromise and that it is a credit to those who worked it out.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say that from the start I have completely subscribed to the theory that there should be a separation of air mail pay from subsidy. I believe that a transportation charge is one thing but that a subsidy is quite another, and that they should be separated completely.

Let me say to my colleague, also, that as he knows our committee has, in all the years I have served on it—and I am sure all the years he has served on the committee—not decided legislative matter on political issues. While there have been times when there were considerable differences in the committee, there were differences of opinion as to the merits of the legislation, never on political grounds; and that completely applies to this legislation; there has been a cross section of opinion both ways in the committee, but a cross section based on an honest difference of opinion and not on a political division in any sense of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the changes made in the bill over the week end number five or six.

There is one amendment made on page 3 on the important subsection dealing with cost. Language was put in that the CAB desired. I believe it is as effective as the previous language and I think it was a good compromise.

Another amendment deals with the time in which these sections shall be put into effect. It went perhaps farther than I would have wanted, but it is not unreasonable.

On page 8 there were several changes made which I do not think are basic and which we were glad to accept.

There are two sections, however, that were discussed and amended that I believe are basic to this bill. This House, however, has a great deal to do in the closing days of this session and I therefore will not fight against the amendments; perhaps they can be perfected in the Senate, or if the bill goes over until next year they can then be discussed. One is on page 6 and deals with the allocation of air-carrier receipts and expenditures. In the original language we stated that in order to determine what the cost of carrying air mail was the air carriers would have to break down their cost into four items: Transportation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail.

The point was made that there were other categories and it was suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who was a member of the Hoover Commission, that we should not name definite categories. It was felt further by gentlemen representing the CAB that in order to determine the cost of carrying the mail these things would have to be done and there was no necessity in writing the amount. The change went a great deal further than it should have, and I think a mistake has been made.

There was another unfortunate change made. It is basic and a correction should

be made if this bill goes to the Senate. Under the bill as we originally planned it, we stated that subsidies should be available to all those planes that have a certificate of operation. During the conference it was suggested that subsidies should be given only to those planes which had a certificate to carry airmail.

Now you give subsidies for three reasons: First, to help develop the airline industry; second, to help the Nation's commerce; and third, to help the Nation's defense. If we give subsidies only to those who happen to have a certificate to carry airmail, we deny subsidies to many other lines that do not carry mail, but who are important to the national defense. For instance, the Slick Airline in Texas has a large fleet of cargo carriers. If they were made eligible for a subsidy, perhaps they could perfect those cargo carriers so that if there were a national emergency they could be used to carry military personnel or cargo.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know the gentleman recognizes that the purpose of this bill is to separate airmail compensation from subsidies. Of course, in connection with these other carriers, while it may or may not be advisable to subsidize them, there is no question of any separation of subsidy because they receive no mail.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it true that a subsidy is given not only for carrying mail but for national defense and to develop the commerce of the Nation? Because of national defense, should not other planes besides those that happen to have certificates to carry mail be included?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is a question which the committee has not considered as yet. This bill is for the purpose of separating compensation for carrying airmail from subsidies. Of course, that subject has not been considered by the committee and hence should not be contained in this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me as long as subsidies are based partly on defense, you should not give the subsidy to only those who have a mail contract.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman desires to introduce a bill which relates to the nonscheduled and nonairmail carrying carriers, of which there are something like 2,400, I am sure the committee will be interested in its consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman is wrong. Only 12 new airlines would be eligible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I opposed the original amendment last Wednesday, I should say for the purpose of the RECORD that this new amendment, in my opinion, is far more satisfactory. It does retain in the bill the essential cost element which is basic to any satisfactory separation.

There are, as others have said, five additional amendments. It is not my

purpose to discuss each of them; however, I would like to join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in what he has said about the probable necessity sometime in the immediate future for considering the wisdom of including other carriers than those who are authorized by certificate to transport mail. We all know that the armed services, particularly the Air Force, is very much concerned about a sound transport system. Certainly we, by our action, do not want to take any step that will be harmful in that respect.

The sixth amendment, which strikes out all of subsection 3 on page 6, is one which I could not personally recommend. However, it is true that in existing law the CAB does have the power to make these allocations. That being true, although they have not done it, and because I have been assured that Mr. Rentzel has said that he believes in separation and is going to see that it is done, and particularly because I realize the practical situation which confronts us here this afternoon, I shall not oppose it. Even without that section this is a bill which in my opinion separates the airmail pay and does it on a cost basis. I think this is so because I cannot conceive of the carriers being able to comply with any order that the CAB issues unless they do allocate their receipts and their expenditures into at least four categories, and those are the four categories that are eliminated by this amendment which will be offered. From a practical point of view I think the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who was a member of the Hoover Commission, was far preferable to striking this entire section, but I will prefer that he speak for himself in terms of that suggestion.

On the whole, I think everyone who has been trying to work this very difficult and technical problem out is entitled to congratulations for what they have tried to do. I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has his doubts about one section. I share those doubts. In the over-all my feeling is definitely this: We have a chance this afternoon to pass a bill which we all agree upon in principle. It will take a long step toward separation. We should have separation by March 31, 1952. Congress will be in session between now and that time. If some of the things we are doing this afternoon are mistakes, I am sure that the committee will come back here and recommend additional legislation.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose the amendments, and I shall support the bill this afternoon.

I do want to say for the RECORD that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] well merits our thanks and appreciation. He introduced the first comprehensive airmail subsidy separation bill, H. R. 2908, on February 21, 1949, the day the Hoover Commission reported its post-office recommendations to Congress. He testified before our committee and has cooperated fully with us in this exceedingly difficult task of bringing to you an amendment upon which we would join in

recommending favorable action. Although it is true that neither he nor I can recommend certain of the amendments and voted against them while the effort was being made to work out the best possible compromise, it must be a source of real satisfaction to him to have so much of the vitally important points of his original suggestions now in this bill before us.

I can and do say that with this bill passed we are in an excellent position to see to it that the details are worked out and that there is no reason why we should not have the actual costs of carrying the air mail in the open by March 31, 1952. Then only those subsidies which can be justified as required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense bill be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 9184 was before the House last week and we had before us a substitute bill, I made the suggestion that the measure be sent to, or taken back by, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further consideration in an endeavor to work out some sort of an agreed bill that would carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. That action was taken by the House, with the consent of the Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in charge of the bill and the Democratic and Republican leadership of the House. Later the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was courteous enough to extend me an invitation to appear before it, and to permit me to present some suggested amendments for consideration of the committee. Those suggested amendments, I should state, had been prepared by a number of us who had been interested in the Hoover Commission's work.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say on behalf of the group that met that the suggestions made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] were most valuable in helping us get together.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate your statement very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to concur in the statement just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. The gentleman who is now speaking, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, was a Member of our committee for a number of years, a very active one at the time he was on the committee, and familiar with some of the problems we have. Out of that experience he has given to us very valuable information and has helped the committee get together and come together and resolve the issues as we have

presented them here today. We express our appreciation to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. The Interstate Commerce Committee, in its wisdom, did accept some of those amendments, at least in meaning and in content, if not in exact words, and has brought before the House an amended bill which has been agreed to by all the members of that committee.

I find the bill as amended, is in line with the Hoover Commission's recommendations, and will accomplish the purpose of those recommendations.

I can find just one thing about the bill with which I might personally differ and about which the Hoover Commission, as such, might have something to say. I refer to page 6. As mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] we had suggested a portion of section 3 be retained in the new bill, down to the word "rendered" in line 22, to have the Civil Aeronautics Board, as a matter of instruction and policy, prescribe standards for keeping airline accounts and records. However, I understand the committee has been assured by the spokesman for and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board that such statutory language is entirely unnecessary, inasmuch as the Board now has that authority under present law. In other words, that there is no need for repeating in this act the authority the Board already has under present law, and that the Civil Aeronautics Board will do exactly that which would be required if this section were incorporated in the bill now before us.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Permit me to say that the Civil Aeronautics Act is much more broad and helpful to them than the language contained in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that is right. I believe we discussed in your committee the fact that the bill as originally brought to the House did restrict the Board to a certain extent. The amendments I have suggested, and which were prepared by our group, would have eliminated some of those restrictions, and would have left the authority with the Board practically the same as the Board contends it now has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand further that your committee does have statements from the Civil Aeronautics Board, and pledges or promises, whatever you might wish to call them, that the Board will follow faithfully the intent and purpose of the proposed amendment, and your committee therefore feels it is not necessary to write the amendment into the law. That being the case, and with that understanding, and notwithstanding the previous recommen-

dation of those who worked on the Hoover Commission, I feel that we should accept this bill in order, as members of the committee have pointed out, that we may get action at this session of Congress. I believe the measure the committee has reported out and brought here is one all of us can accept and support, to the great benefit of all concerned, especially the taxpaying public.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Personally I am glad to see the gentleman express himself on these various proposals, particularly the amendment to which he is addressing himself now. I appreciate the fact that he is willing to accept the committee action and go along. I believe it would be more advantageous to have it in this form than in the language the gentleman discussed with us a few days ago.

I might say to the gentleman further, to clarify this issue in his own mind, the Big Four case, which is being considered now, is having brought into it this particular point as an issue. The counsel to the Board advised us that they are in this particular and specific case putting into effect these various categories to which the gentleman is referring at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

In closing, may I reiterate that I believe this bill is in such shape each and every one of us can support it without any reservations.

May I also compliment the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having met a rather difficult problem ably and fairly, and very well. All the members of that committee are entitled to great commendation for having worked so diligently on this particular legislation, have compromised their differences and come up with what I believe is a good bill.

I hope it will receive the unanimous vote of this body.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in view of my statement and the conference which was had, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and accept the substitute in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for a number of years past, and previous to the formation of the so-called Hoover Commission, I have been very much interested in the subject of separation of air-mail pay from subsidy monies. The action of the committee today in bringing out the bill entitled "Separation of subsidy from air-mail pay" as now amended and weakened is at least a step in the right direction. I am not as hopeful as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], that we are going to get this legislation enacted by both bodies during the present Congress. I feel it is highly important, however, that this House should right

now demonstrate its intention and its eagerness that the taxpayer should know exactly how much of his tax dollar is being paid the airlines for carrying his mail, and how much is in the form of outright subsidy.

In my humble estimation, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of the subcommittee handling funds for the Civil Aeronautics Board, the airlines have been permitted to delay this needed reform for entirely too long. But be that as it may, I am going to go along on the compromise which was arrived at by the members of this committee on Thursday last after many, many hours of discussion. There are a number of matters which have been added to and deleted from the bill by way of amendments which will now be offered here on the floor by the committee with which I could not at all agree.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has manifested great interest in this problem for some time. The gentleman from New York joined in the conferences we had on this and helped to work out these differences so that we are able to come before the Membership of the House as we are today with these different points which have been at issue resolved.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, my ideas did not prevail. I was outvoted on every issue except insertion of UPU, rates.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I commend the gentleman from New York for the position he has taken. I believe that he has had the same fears about this measure as I have had and expressed. However, I feel rather certain if the Civil Aeronautics Board will do that which they have pledged to the committee they will do, and that is put in this accounting system, they can and will properly separate and show what is paid for mail transportation and what is paid for subsidy and thus the whole purpose of the Hoover Commission recommendation will be accomplished.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio to that extent, but I go a bit further. For instance, in this bill as amended there is no provision for allocation of costs. I think that such allocation was a vital part of the need for the original bill. I felt that the original bill introduced by the distinguished gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HESELTON] was a good bill which did not require amendment and that to take out the allocation of costs between the four categories mentioned on page 6 of the bill, in my humble estimation is not the thing to do.

I also felt and so stated in the conference that the Postmaster General should be required to appear as a party at every hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board and should in behalf of the public be required to submit a state-

ment of the rates recommended by him as being fair and reasonable for delivery of the mail.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the Postmaster has that authority.

Mr. ROONEY. The law does not now require him to do so. However, all legislation is the result of compromise, and feeling that it is best to get the House of Representatives of this closing Eighty-first Congress on record as favoring the general principle that air-mail pay and subsidy money should and must be separated, I shall go along.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We appreciate it very much. I also favored the four categories, originally, but the Civil Aeronautics Board pointed out to me that naming four categories would restrict, and that in making this division they might want to divide it into more than four categories.

Mr. ROONEY. When you serve for a number of years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations you do not pay too much attention to what many of these agencies tell you. They never like to assume additional responsibility but delight in the receipt of greater power.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with that statement of the gentleman also, but I do not limit it to just serving on the Committee of Appropriations where you learn that. You learn it from serving on other committees as well. But I believe there is something to the argument that when you write into the law a restriction of four categories you bar other categories. You seemingly set up only four instead of possibly others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with what the gentleman has said about eliminating the duty of the Postmaster General to recommend on all rates, but will not the gentleman agree with me that there is another factor, aside from the reasons so ably stated by him, that we have the Civil Aeronautics Board in a quasi-judicial position, you have the airlines coming in, with able counsel and able accountants, thoroughly presenting their case; but there is one great group of people who would not be represented unless the Postmaster General did present the public's case. I hope the Postmaster General will accept that responsibility if he has that power now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW:

Page 3, line 19, strike out "by an air carrier", and on page 3, line 21, strike out "include a statement of" and insert in lieu thereof "state and support in detail."

And on page 3, line 25, and page 4, line 1, strike out "(A) a statement of the rates recommended by him as being fair and reasonable, and (B)."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments which has been agreed to by the group that has been described. This amendment removes the requirement that the Postmaster General state the rates which he considers fair and reasonable in every case where a petition is filed for the fixing or changing of rates. The Post Office Department has stated that to require it to suggest a rate in all cases would be to require it to build up a staff of rate experts which would unnecessarily duplicate the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board. When the Postmaster General is the petitioner, however, he still would be required to state and support the rates he recommends.

There is no argument against this amendment, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time, not with any thought of opposing the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], but to emphasize the desire upon the part of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that his amendment and the others that have been adopted by the subcommittee will be adopted by the House.

In this connection I would like to further emphasize to the Members of the House that notwithstanding there has been some controversy between the members of the committee with respect to certain language in the bill, there has never been any controversy or difference of opinion between them with respect to the approval of fundamental purpose of this bill. I believe the membership of the House is interested in the fundamental purpose of the bill; namely, to separate air-mail compensation from subsidy in order that there may be a clear understanding with respect to what is paid for each.

The amendments that are offered as a result of the further study given to controversial questions have been arrived at as a result of a very sincere effort on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and those interested Members of the House who have met with it. These amendments do not in any way change the underlying purpose of the bill, which, as I have stated, is to separate air-mail pay and subsidy. The controversy, based upon differing viewpoints, has arisen entirely through an effort to adopt proper language with reference to the formula of cost. The language of the amendments which have been agreed upon, as has been said already, have not in each case met entirely the views of each individual; however, the amendments that are presented to you do represent compromise language arrived at after very

serious consideration of all the differing viewpoints that have been expressed.

The fundamental purpose has been that whatever formula was used or by whatever words it was expressed, it was intended that there should be a fair and reasonable rate allowed for carrying mail and whatever might be paid as a subsidy was to be separately considered.

Undoubtedly there will be some questions to arise in the future that may require further consideration by the committee, but at the present moment with the light the committee has and after the fullest discussion and consideration of the differing viewpoints, this bill as amended has been recommended to the House with the thought that it will maintain the basic principle and purpose of the bill. I believe that it is the basic principle of separation that the average Member of the House is interested in, and I trust the House will have confidence in the recommendations of the committee at this time, and, be assured of the intention of the committee to make certain that as experience comes to us in the future, that it will give consideration to any changes that may seem necessary to make the law just and equitable from the standpoint of the airlines and the taxpayers as well.

It is the desire of the committee that this bill be adopted at this session of the Congress. I think it will be a great achievement for this House and the Congress to adopt this legislation which comes to us as a result of the study that has been made by the Hoover Commission.

In addition to the recommendation of the Hoover Commission there have been many other studies that have been made, including studies by the Brookings Institute. All of these studies have resulted in the same conclusion, namely, that there should be a separation between air-mail compensation and subsidies. This bill will accomplish that very thing, and I am hopeful that the House will have confidence in what the committee has done in this respect and that it will give its approval to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 4, line 12, strike out "a certificated air carrier" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "any air carrier holding a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, obviously the work of the members of the subcommittee, together with the able assistance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] was very helpful and has brought forth some good results. I want to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and the other members of the committee for the very fine, able, and constructive manner, as well as for the conscientious and determined efforts of coming to-

gether and to work out some of these points at issue in a manner acceptable to us under the circumstances.

When I offered the substitute last week it will be recalled there were some four or five specific objections I had to the bill reported by the committee. One was that it extended subsidies to all certificated carriers. Another was the cost-standard provision contained in the bill reported by the committee. Another was the cost allocation of the various categories of service which would have brought about a complete change in bookkeeping and a complete revision in the accounting system of the air carriers and would make it difficult for the Civil Aeronautics Board to administer.

Then there was a further objection I had with reference to the international carriers and the complications that would result in connection with the proposed bill. We have tried to resolve these points of difference. We have done a fairly substantial job, in my opinion. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] said a moment ago, none of us are 100 percent satisfied, but we do feel that in the give-and-take proposition as good a job as could be hoped for has been accomplished. Personally, I am not satisfied at all with the effects or the results, so far as the international carriers' situation is concerned. I am not satisfied altogether about what the result may be in connection with the UPU rates and their effect on our carriers and just what their situation may be competitively with other international or foreign air carriers. Nevertheless, this is a part of the work we did as we come together and bring it to you in a manner that we believe will be for the best interest.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I fully subscribe to what he has just said. I confess that on the subject of the international carriage of mail and UPU rates my own mind is somewhat in a state of confusion. I hear one view of some in the Post Office Department, another by the CAB, and still another by representatives of the airlines. I have not been able to satisfy myself about the situation. I do not say any of these gentlemen have misstated the facts. The trouble is, in my opinion, we have not always gotten the best information and the most thorough information that I would like to have on the subject, before we legislate on such an important matter.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the reason I said it is not altogether clear to me what the ultimate effect of this will be insofar as international carriers are concerned and the competitive position; nevertheless I do feel it is a matter that can be cleared up later and I am sure it will be.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. With reference to the particular amendment the gentleman has offered, over the week-end I

had occasion to look over the brief of the Seaboard Airline's case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. The situation that bothers me is the cutting of this back to the certificated mail carriers. This particular line is the only unsubsidized freight service in the international field and they want to go forward with their work. They are carrying more freight now than any other single line, and I think it would be a great mistake for us to arbitrarily cut them out from possible consideration. I am sure the gentleman feels, knowing him and his ability and his fairness, that if situations like that develop, the gentleman would be glad to join in presenting a further solution.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. As has been so well said already, we did not have hearings on that particular point of issue before our committee. If it is a question that is to be taken up and considered, I will join with the other members of the committee at an appropriate and convenient time to take it up and give it most thorough consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said a moment ago, this is a bill to separate subsidy from air-mail pay; that is all. It is not a bill to extend subsidy. That is the way I understand it. This amendment that I propose here limits the provisions of this bill just as it was intended, that is, to the separation of air-mail pay from subsidy payments by the Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is not this amendment which the gentleman is offering now identical with the amendment recommended by the gentleman from Ohio after his discussion with the members of the task force of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. HARRIS. Identical. The amendment limits the class of carriers which may apply for subsidy payments to those carriers holding mail certificates. This limitation conforms to existing law. Under the bill as reported any certificated air carrier may apply for subsidy. The class of air carriers which may apply for subsidy should not be broadened beyond present law until this question is more fully explored. This is in accordance with the agreement and understanding of all of the Members present last week when we had our sessions.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be adopted and the other amendments we agreed to will be adopted and that this bill as amended will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: Page 5, beginning in line 22, strike out "to make, with respect to the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending March 31, 1952, or with respect to any part thereof," and insert in lieu thereof "to make."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment removes the limitation on the period during which the Board will have power to make temporary subsidy payments. The need to make temporary subsidy payments will not be limited to the period immediately following the separation between rates and subsidy. Situations may arise at any time in the future where the difficulty of determining final subsidy payments makes it necessary to have authority to make temporary subsidy payments pending final determination as to the subsidy payments which should be made.

Mr. Chairman, this is another recommendation of the group which I mentioned a moment ago, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 6, line 10, strike out "on or after July 1, 1951," and insert in lieu thereof "after March 31, 1952."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments that have been referred to. It simply gives the Civil Aeronautics Board nine additional months to do this job of separating mail pay from subsidy. One of the reasons is that the bill was reported last August, and some 3 or 4 months have elapsed since that time. It is necessary that the Board have additional time within which to do this job. This amendment provides that.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. As I heard the amendment read, it was to strike out the language "on or after July 1" and substitute "after March 31." Is that what the gentleman intended to do?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is the language of the amendment. The words that are to be placed in the bill are "after March 31, 1952."

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman intends to eliminate "on or after July 1"?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The amendment as offered is in a form which I think is correct. As I understand it, the intent is to have the separation take effect beginning with the second calendar quarter of 1952. This amendment could have been drafted to read "on or after April 1, 1952." The same result is reached by the pending amendment, which reads "after March 31, 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

ALLOCATION OF AIR CARRIER RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 3. Section 407 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) By inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and
(2) By inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) On or before July 1, 1951, and from time to time thereafter, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, after notice and hearing, prescribe standards by which air carriers, in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda, shall allocate receipts from, and expenditures for, the air transportation services rendered by them among the following four categories: Transportation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail. From and after July 1, 1951, it shall be unlawful for any air carrier, in keeping any account, record, or memorandum (other than any additional account, record, or memorandum kept pursuant to the proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection), to allocate any receipt from, or expenditure for, any air transportation service it renders in any manner other than a manner which conforms to the standards prescribed pursuant to this paragraph."

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 206 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "civil aeronautics" a comma and the following: "including data relative to the mail payments and subsidy payments, both in the aggregate and on an individual basis, made under this act with a separate analysis of the bases upon which each such mail payment and each such subsidy payments was provided."

STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to make studies in connection with any of the provisions of this act. In the conduct of such studies the Board is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on of such studies by such persons or organizations as may be designated by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the chairmen of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

(b) On or before April 1, 1951, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, on the basis of a comprehensive study, render a written report to the Congress on what aggregate sums would be required during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and during each of the four succeeding fiscal years (1) to provide fair compensation for services to be rendered by air carriers in the carriage of the mails, in accordance with the provisions of section 406 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended by this act, and (2) to provide for payment of essential subsidy, in accordance with section 406 (c) of such act, as amended by this act. Such report shall include a study of the potential revenues from all forms of air traffic and of the potential economies which could be achieved in airline costs, as well as such other factors as may be pertinent to the development, with the least possible expenditures by the United States, of an efficient and economical air

transport industry to the extent and of the character and quality required for the national defense, the commerce of the United States, and the postal service.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board such sums, not to exceed \$300,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: On pages 6 and 7, strike out all of section 3, lines 11 to 25, inclusive, on page 6, and lines 1 to 7, inclusive, on page 7, and renumber the subsequent sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this was one of the controversial features of the bill which was originally before us and which has been worked out by the compromise agreement.

This amendment strikes out section 3, which provided that the Civil Aeronautics Board would prescribe standards for the allocation of air-carrier receipts and expenditures for specified categories. It has been pointed out that the Civil Aeronautics Board, under existing law, has full power to prescribe these standards; and it is apparent that the Board will have to prescribe such standards in order to achieve the separation. However, in view of the difficult nature of the problem it is believed preferable to leave to the judgment of the Board the time when these accounting changes must take place.

Mr. Chairman, it happens to be a fact that under section 407 of the Civil Aeronautics law there is very comprehensive provision for the setting up of an accounting system. It took the CAB and the airlines something like 3 years to set up that system. The regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board comprise a book of approximately 100 pages of instructions. It took thousands and I presume hundreds of thousands of dollars to set up that accounting system throughout all the airlines of the United States. It is felt that the language in the present bill would be much more restrictive than the CAB might feel in order to determine the separation of air-mail pay and subsidy.

In the minority report of this bill there is fully set out the objections of the CAB with persuasive logic, the reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

It is felt it would be far better to permit the Board to have that leeway and from such studies as they may make or their experience may show to provide for a proper system of accounting to complete the separation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Do I understand the gentleman's position to be that the Civil Aeronautics Board already and upon passage of the pending bill has the power to prescribe standards by which air carriers in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda shall allocate receipts from and expenditures for the air transportation services rendered by them, among the following four categories: Transpor-

tation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail? Does the Civil Aeronautics Board now have that authority?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have that authority now. In addition, they have much more power because it may be, if I understand the situation, that about 80 percent of the airline business is on joint rates, and they have some tremendous difficulties.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We specifically talked about this while we were in the series of meetings the other day. Would the gentleman give his impression as to what the CAB has indicated the CAB expects to do about this particular thing immediately?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is my understanding they will set up such a system, and they are now in the process of working it out. The fact of the matter is that in the so-called Big Four cases the CAB has informed us that they have learned much themselves, so far as this subject is concerned, and they will undoubtedly follow up with additional regulations which will require all of the things we want to show with reference to the separation of air-mail pay from subsidies.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not fair to state furthermore that the fact the language is not there is no evidence the Congress is not very anxious that they, insofar as possible, separate it into these four categories, or any other categories necessary to make this picture a clear picture? Certainly, it is my hope the four categories can be used. I would not want to limit the categories to four, however. If other categories are necessary, they, too, should be used.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH:

On page 8, line 4, strike out "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1952."

On page 8, strike out lines 7 and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "It estimates will be required during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment postpones for 1 year the date by which the Civil Aeronautics Board is to report to the Congress with respect to costs to the Government of air-mail pay and subsidy. One of the purposes is to give the Board more time within which to make its study in that particular connection. When it reports, it is to report for the following fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and to report for 1 year only rather than for 5 years as the bill originally provided. It is felt that this is a more practical solution to the objective which the committee was seeking by the original language.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say of course this bill is a compromise and the amendments which we have offered today are a compromise, and while perhaps none of us is satisfied, including myself, nevertheless, for the sake of getting a bill, we have gone along thus far. In no way have I personally changed the views which I expressed the other day when this bill was on the floor. I intend in the extension of my remarks to give some reasons why certain further changes should be made in this legislation before it is finally enacted into law and to that end I now ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, under authority to extend my remarks I reiterate that this bill should not be enacted into law and, in fact, no bill should be enacted until the Senate committee study of this subject has been completed and become available. However, as the House appears to be insistent upon some bill being passed now, I can say that this bill, H. R. 9184, with the amendments agreed to is in far better shape than it started out to be, and that doubtless it would have been had not an agreement on amendments been reached by our unofficial conference between differing members. The bill H. R. 9184 in its present form is not too seriously different from H. R. 9305, which we offered as a substitute except that this bill includes our air carriers in foreign commerce and certain other provisions which I shall discuss.

SEPARATION OF MAIL PAY AND SUBSIDY OF AIR CARRIERS OPERATING IN FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is the wrong time to require separation of compensatory mail pay from subsidy to our air carriers in foreign commerce and doubt that a right time will come until foreign-flag carriers do likewise. Hidden subsidy is being furnished to all international carriers, whatever flag they carry. Our own flag international carriers are privately owned. Other flag air carriers are all government owned, and as such are not required by their governments to adhere to the same rigid accounting as are ours. That is the initial disadvantage we suffer. While those governments can see the published costs of our carriers, we cannot do the same for each of the foreign-flag carriers. Therefore, by our disclosing the amount of subsidy we pay to our airlines in foreign commerce, we lay ourselves open to a subsidy war. That alone is sufficient reason to exclude our air carriers in foreign commerce from this bill.

But for sake of argument, let us assume that the separation principle is correct. We have a number of so-called national-interest air routes. I do not think it is smart to disclose those routes and their cost in terms of subsidy support, and such would be required under this bill.

But in the general case what would be the effect? Let us take the three situ-

ations that would arise. First is the case where the compensatory rate to be established turns out to be greater than the rate now agreed in the Universal Postal Union—UPU—of 6 gold francs, or \$2.86, per ton-mile in the North Atlantic. Second would be where the compensatory rate comes out equal to the UPU rate. Third is the case where the compensatory rate is less than the UPU rate.

In the first case, i. e., where the compensatory rate turns out to be greater than the UPU rate, then in that case our Post Office Department would be forced to offer our mail to foreign-flag carriers, because their rate, the UPU rate, would be cheaper. If the Post Office Department should refuse to do that, then foreign governments would have reason to claim we were discriminating against their lower-rate carriers in favor of our own higher-rate carriers. Compulsion would also come directly for budgetary reasons of the Post Office Department. At that point our carriers would lose the mail pay almost altogether and the subsidy payments would have to be increased accordingly. We would then have to pay twice—once to the foreign-flag carrier for carrying the mail and again to our own flag carriers as additional subsidy.

In the second case, that is, where the compensatory rate turns out to be equal to the UPU rate, an unlikely happenstance, our carriers would be on an equal footing with foreign-flag carriers so far as carrying the mail is concerned, but subsidy pay, if any, being disclosed unilaterally by us would open the way to charges against us on account of paying subsidy, and a subsidy rate war would ensue.

In the third case, that is, where the compensatory rate would turn out to be less than the UPU rate, then our Post Office Department, for budgetary reasons, would find it incumbent upon themselves to give all of our mail to our own carriers, instead of giving some of it to foreign-flag carriers as they do now. In that case foreign governments would doubtless retaliate by not giving any of their mail to our flag carriers as they do now, and hence our carriers as well as theirs would be flying their home-bound courses empty of mail, and that would be a loss to all concerned and require us to pay added subsidy to our flag air carriers.

Therefore, if any separation of subsidy from mail pay is to be made, it probably would be least damaging to us to establish a compensatory rate at whatever the UPU rate is at any given time, instead of going through the expensive process of trying to find a true cost. But that probably is too simple an answer to appeal to anyone.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF H. R. 8194

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous other reasons why I feel opposed to this bill at this time, but among them are the following:

First, as we are on the brink of war, this is no time to be asking either the Civil Aeronautics Board or the air carriers to divert their attention and resources to this business. At any time the National Defense Establishment may requisition a large number of planes and

crews and thus throw accounting and the rigid accounting procedures in this bill into a cocked hat.

Secondly, the bill establishes a rigid accounting of cost of service which is a part of a larger service, and no two accountants can ever agree on exactly how to separate and allocate costs on an actual-cost basis. At best, the allocations of charges must be done empirically. To write "cost," as such, into the law may require a long court procedure and final Supreme Court decision as to what cost is to mean in each case that can be brought before it.

Thirdly, while compensation for carrying the mail at determined rates becomes an obligation of the Government, that is not the case in this bill so far as subsidy payments are concerned. The bill, H. R. 8194, leaves that question up to the whim of the Congress through its appropriations for paying subsidy. If the Congress appropriates less than the Civil Aeronautics Board determines as necessary, then the CAB must reallocate the subsidy payments appropriated accordingly. This means that no airline receiving subsidy can know what subsidy it is to be paid until after the Congress has acted and the Board then has acted accordingly. It means that airlines requiring subsidy will not be able to finance their operations as no responsible banking organization or group can offer finances on such a tenuous and uncertain prospect. Hence either Government financing or outright Government ownership of subsidized airlines would eventuate necessarily.

If it is desirable to control the continued enjoyment of route certificates then this is not the way to control it. A far better way would be to empower the CAB to issue an order to an airline to appear at a hearing to show cause as to why its certificate or any route certificate should not be revoked as being no longer in the public interest and to the public convenience and necessity to continue such certificate in force. Under this bill any air carrier or any route or segment of a route can be cut off without warning merely as a result of a specific cut or even a general cut in appropriations made by the Congress. This process can eventuate into overriding even a Presidential certification order and generally bring financial chaos to the entire commercial aviation industry. The payment of subsidy to an airline should be a contractual matter and not an indirect means of canceling certificates of public convenience and necessity without notice or hearing.

Mr. Chairman, there are other objections to this bill, H. R. 8194, as amended in the House, but these or any of them that I have presented appear to me as good and sufficient reason why H. R. 8194 should not become law in these last days of the Eighty-first Congress. I hope and trust that the counterpart of our committee in the other body will agree so that we may take another look at the subject in the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a letter which the Post Office De-

partment wrote to the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, on December 7, 1950. The Postmaster General mentioned several provisions he would like to see in the bill. There have been no hearings on some of these; although the committee has great confidence in the Post Office Department, it would wish to have hearings on all the suggestions.

I simply want the RECORD to show that the letter was considered by the group of members when we met the other day. Since there were no hearings held on some of the recommendations contained in the letter, we felt that we could not act on them at this time, but in the future we shall be glad to consider those recommendations. Also I desire to include a letter dated December 7, 1950, which was written to the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN, by Hon. D. W. Rentzel.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 7, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I believe it to be of the utmost importance that I communicate to you at this time my feelings about H. R. 8184, a bill designed to accomplish the separation of the subsidy element from mail pay, now actively being considered by the House. While the Administration and the Board are on record as favoring separation legislation and while H. R. 8184 essentially accomplishes that purpose, there are nevertheless several very serious objections to some of the provisions of this bill. I shall not burden you here with a detailed statement of the objections, for they appear in a letter from the acting chairman of the Board to Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA, quoted in full on pages 18-20 of the report accompanying the bill. The views expressed in that letter were substantially the same as those expressed in response to a request by Congressman BECKWORTH several weeks previous to Congressman O'HARA's inquiry. At that time we submitted in outline form a comparison between the provisions of H. R. 8184 and the suggestions of the Board for a suitable bill, submitted by its chairman on February 15, 1950, before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We are enclosing a copy of that submission for your convenience.

The principal objections of the Board referred to above were as follows:

1. The bill extends opportunity for subsidy to carriers not now eligible by making all certificated carriers eligible.
2. The Board is not given authority to fix temporary subsidy payments pending the fixing of permanent subsidy.
3. The bill provides that the Board shall order each carrier to allocate costs and revenues between the different services, but apparently does not afford a particular carrier the opportunity for a semijudicial hearing to determine the propriety of such an order as applied to it.
4. The provisions as to the time in which the change-over should be accomplished are not clear and will result in confusion.

The objections that the Board has hitherto expressed to H. R. 8184, which objections I understand are not opposed by the administration, are the same today as they were before. It is true that by a subsequent amendment to the bill an attempt was made to cure one of these objections by giving the Board the authority to fix temporary subsidy payments for the period July 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952. This amendment, while

allowing the Board a little breathing spell in the tremendous job imposed upon it in changing over to the new scheme of determining separately service and subsidy payments, does not eliminate the essential objection. In the first place, it does not allow enough of a breathing spell. It is difficult to see how the Board will be able to fix permanent rates and subsidies within the time contemplated by the bill. The result will be that many carriers will have to operate without substantial sums obviously due them from the Government. These carriers cannot but be seriously harmed by the delay. Quite aside from transition period problems, it is essential that the Board have a continuing authority to make temporary subsidy payments. The airline industry is still in a dynamic stage and with the nature and the risks involved in its operations, crises are to be expected more frequently than in ordinary public utilities. A good example of that was the period after the recent war. It is desirable that the flexibility with respect to temporary payments that the Board has under the present act be continued.

The Board feels that the elimination of the foregoing objections, which would make H. R. 8184 more nearly comparable to the bill suggested by the Board, would result in a bill much more administratively feasible than is H. R. 8184. We therefore urge that serious consideration be given to the Board's objections to H. R. 8184.

In closing, I should like to reiterate the Board's support of separation legislation. We are actively engaged in a proceeding to establish service rates for the largest four carriers in the industry. Our staff has put in a tremendous amount of work on the case and has now reached a point where it can make significant contributions to the very difficult problem of setting up definite standards for separation of the subsidy element. The Board continues to believe, further, that separation legislation should be passed at the earliest possible moment consistent with the drafting of a bill that will better accomplish the task. It is only on the question of the adequacy of the bill now actively under consideration that the Board has serious misgivings and believes that a more satisfactory bill can be worked out. I shall hold myself ready to supply any additional information and assistance that you may consider desirable.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
Chairman.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LINEHAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] for their invaluable work last week in trying to perfect this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8184, pursuant to House Resolution 854, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY), there were—ayes 66, noes none.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter addressed to him by John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times, and an editorial from the Detroit Times; and further to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter and tabulations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BRAMBLETT for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1774. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$11,000,000 for the Selective Service System (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1775. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1950, pursuant to Public Law No. 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1776. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relating to factors which may tend to affect adversely our competitive enterprise system during a period of defense mobilization, pursuant to section 708 (e) of Public Law No. 774, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1777. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Maria Tome Da Silva Lawver, file No. A-6008146 CR 25896, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Henryk Oselka, file No. A-6802109 CR 26013, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9828. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 3183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 9890. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9891. A bill to eliminate the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 9892. A bill to exempt from the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act sales of food for human consumption in hotels, restaurants, cafes, bars, and other establishments where the sales price of the food furnished an individual patron is more than \$1.25; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 880. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and \$350 funeral expenses to William Earle Griffin, son of Helen M. Griffin, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 9894. A bill for the relief of Thomas I. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 9895. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 9896. A bill for the relief of Elias Miltiades Jordanopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 9897. A bill for the relief of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9898. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of stillness as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear like bells at evening pealing the call of the better angels of our nature: We come seeking wide horizons around our noisy lives. Midst all the busy shuttles of legislation, as here is woven the fabric of law and order, shielding the life of our democracy and of free peoples everywhere, may we not be so enmeshed in the immediate mechanics of our solemn task as to lose sight of the total pattern shown in the mount of vision. As we have undertaken on this continent a government of, by and for the people, may we not lack the spiritual quality and a constant sense of the divine sovereignty, without which no such government can long endure.

So make us faithful ministers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. O'CONOR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 11, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9184) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.